



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/521,862

01/21/2005

Paulus Cornelis Neervoort

NL 020772

1298

24737

7590

03/16/2010

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

HOEL, MATTHEW D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/16/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner upon reviewing the case believed that the new dependent claims pertaining to determining the size and shape of the virtual playfield corresponding to the actual playfield were significant in light of Kagan and Sharma and the independent claims as a whole. The examiner believed that these limitations corresponding to the determined type of game being played put into independent form would be allowable and sum up what the claims as a whole are trying to do. The examiner believes that determining the size of the playfield is supported at parent application EP 02078012.8, 7:14-19. The other proposed limitations are supported by the current specification. Mr. Thorne suggested putting the relative orientations of the mobile devices as well as the relative locations of the mobile devices into the independent claim for discussion purposes; these limitations correspond to para. 117 of the specification 2005/0288100 A1. In para. 117, the tops of the modular units facing each other allow these players to be on one team; the bottoms of the modular units facing each other allow these players to be on a second team. The examiner has 112 considerations about this passage as it is unclear whether it is an electrical or wireless connection, which would determine if the orientation is a physical connection or merely whether or not the devices angularly face each other. Referring to Kagan, Fig. 1, these modular units are already facing each other, so they can presumably be on the same team. The IR detectors of Kagan will have a conical zone of sensitivity as evidenced by Thompson (5,517,201 A, 3:46-4:9). One team of players using Kagan's devices could face each other to line up in each others' IR sensitivity zones to form one team; another could do the same to form another team. The examiner believed that Kagan disclosed assigning players with the modular devices to separate teams, each team comprising two or more players, and that Sharma demonstrated the obviousness of playing a game, such as a virtual volleyball game with the players' virtual positions corresponding to their physical positions (Figs. 2, 3, & 5, and corresponding descriptions). Mr. Thorne may submit proposed amendments by e-mail for discussion purposes. No exact allowable claim language was agreed on..